

health officials from 80 countries today to map out a strategy for minimizing the deaths and destruction that an outbreak might wreak. At the same time, White House officials will meet today with representatives of the U.S. pharmaceutical industry to encourage them to get involved in the manufacture of a flu vaccine.

But, Madam Speaker, Congress needs to do more. My colleague, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), has been a leader in trying to push the Congress and the administration to do more to prepare. In late July, Mrs. LOWEY introduced H.R. 3369, the Attacking Viral Influenza Across Nations Act, the AVIAN Act, which provides for a comprehensive national effort to prepare for a flu outbreak. The AVIAN Act requires the Federal Government to create plans for and respond to a pandemic outbreak. It orders the procurement of antiviral treatments and vaccines for a Strategic National Stockpile.

The bill also promotes increased research in the pandemic flu, its vaccines and treatments, and expands efforts to prevent pandemic avian flu both domestically and internationally. I am a proud cosponsor of the AVIAN Act, and I strongly urge my colleagues to join us.

I was heartened to see last week that the Senate voted to add \$4 billion to the U.S. fight against deadly avian flu by stocking up on antiviral drugs and increasing global surveillance of the disease. The gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) and I are circulating a letter to ask House conferees to support the Senate request, and I hope our colleagues will join in that effort.

Madam Speaker, I have spoken many times in this Chamber about the danger we face from nuclear terrorism, which I believe is a primary threat to our way of life. The only other threat that remotely approaches a nuclear attack is that posed by a global flu pandemic, one which could kill tens of millions of people. We failed to prepare for 9/11. We failed to prepare adequately for Hurricane Katrina. We must not fail to prepare for a flu pandemic.

COMING HOME MAKES SENSE, STAYING DOES NOT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Madam Speaker, coming home makes sense; staying does not.

Supporters of the war in Iraq, as well as some nonsupporters, warn of the dangers if we leave. But is it not quite possible that these dangers are simply a consequence of having gone into Iraq in the first place, rather than a consequence of leaving?

□ 1545

Isn't it possible that staying only makes the situation worse? If chaos re-

sults after our departure, it is because we occupied Iraq, not because we left. The original reasons for our preemptive strike are long forgotten, having been based on false assumptions. The justification given now is that we must persist in this war or else dishonor those who already have died or been wounded. We are also told civil strife likely will engulf all of Iraq.

But what is the logic of perpetuating a flawed policy where more Americans die just because others have suffered? More American deaths cannot possibly help those who have already been injured or killed.

Civil strife, if not civil war, already exists in Iraq. And despite the infighting, all factions oppose our occupation. The insistence on using our military to occupy and run Iraq provides convincing evidence to our detractors inside and outside of Iraq that we have no intention of leaving.

Building permanent military bases and a huge embassy confirms these fears.

We deny the importance of oil and Israel's influence on our policy, yet we fail to convince the Arab/Muslim world that our intentions are purely humanitarian.

In truth, our determined presence in Iraq actually increases the odds of regional chaos, inciting Iran and Syria, while aiding Osama Bin Laden in his recruiting efforts. Leaving Iraq would do the opposite, though not without some dangers that rightfully should be blamed on our unwise invasion rather than our exit.

Many experts believe Bin Laden welcomed our invasion and occupation of two Muslim countries. It bolsters his claim that the United States intended to occupy and control the Middle East all along. This has galvanized radical Muslim fundamentalists against us. Osama Bin Laden's campaign would surely suffer if we left.

We should remember that losing a war to China over the control of North Korea ultimately did not enhance communism in China, as she now has accepted many capitalist principles. In fact, China today outproduces us in many ways, as reflected by our negative trade balance with her.

We lost a war in Vietnam and the domino theory that communism would spread throughout Southeast Asia was proven wrong. Today, Vietnam accepts American investment dollars and technology. We maintain a trade relationship with Vietnam that the war never achieved.

We contained the USSR and her thousands of nuclear warheads without military confrontation, leading to the collapse and the disintegration of a powerful Soviet empire. Today, we trade with Russia and her neighbors as the market economy spreads throughout the world without the use of arms.

We should heed the words of Ronald Reagan about his experience with a needless and mistaken military occupation of Lebanon. Sending troops into

Lebanon seemed like a good idea in 1983, but in 1990, President Reagan said in his memoirs, "We did not appreciate fully enough the depth of the hatred and complexity of the problems that made the Middle East such a jungle. In the weeks immediately after the bombing, I believed the last thing we should do was turn tail and leave. Yet, the irrationality of Middle Eastern politics forced us to rethink our policy there."

During the occupation of Lebanon by American, French and Israeli troops between 1982 and 1986 there were 41 suicide terrorist attacks in that country. One horrific attack killed 241 U.S. Marines. Yet, once these foreign troops were removed, the suicide attacks literally stopped. Today, we should once again rethink our policy in this region.

Madam Speaker, this is the point I want to make. It is amazing what ending military intervention in the internal affairs of others can achieve. Setting an example of how a free market economy works does wonders. We should have confidence in how freedom works, rather than relying on blind faith and the use of military force to spread our message. Setting an example and using persuasion is always superior to military force in showing how others might live. Force and war are tools of authoritarians. They are never tools of champions of liberty and justice. Force and war inevitably leads to dangerous unintended consequences.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. SCHMIDT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. LIPINSKI. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to assume the time of the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

THE OIL SANDS OF ALBERTA, CANADA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Madam Speaker, I rise today to raise an issue of great importance to our Nation that I fear is being overlooked, the future of the oil sands of Alberta, Canada. Aside from Saudi Arabia's oil fields, these sands contain the largest deposits of oil in the world, and thus, could be critical to our future energy security.

Just a few months ago the Chinese National Offshore Oil Company, CNOOC, attempted to purchase Unocal.